

REMARKS

The allowance of Claims 1 - 10, 13 - 15 is acknowledged.

Claims 16 - 27 are canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner's statement for allowance implies that the claimed invention was allowed because the prior art did not disclose certain limitations found in the claims. The limitations characterized by the Examiner, however, if indeed found in the prior art, would not render the claimed invention invalid under 35 USC §102 because the claimed invention includes a number of limitations not addressed in the reasons for allowance. With respect to 35 USC §103, the rigors of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness include not only a showing that the prior art teaches the entire claimed invention (all limitations are to be considered), but also that combining the various prior art references is suggested in the art or that there would be motivation to make the combination. The comments herein are, as intended, clarifying in a manner consistent with the law.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274